

**Appropriation: Construction & Major Maintenance****Activity: General Management Plans****FY 2002 Enacted: \$11.240 million**

	<b>2002 Enacted To Date</b>	<b>2003 Budget Request</b>	<b>Change From 2002 (+/-)</b>
General Management Planning	7,922	7,900	-22
Special Resource Studies	1,322	1,000	-322
Environmental Impact Statement Planning	1,996	4,996	+3,000
<b>Total Requirements</b>	<b>11,240</b>	<b>13,896</b>	<b>+2,656</b>

**Authorization**

16 U.S.C. 1                      The National Park Service Organic Act  
 16 U.S.C. 1a-5  
 42 U.S.C. 4321  
 Public Law 102-154

**Overview**

Prepare and maintain up-to-date plans to guide National Park Service actions for the protection, use, development, and management of each park unit; prepare strategic plans to guide the future of the System; complete environmental impact statements for special projects, and conduct studies of alternatives for the protection of areas that may have potential for addition to the National Park System.

**Applicable National Park Service Mission Goals**

- Ia** Natural and cultural resources and associated values are protected, restored and maintained in good condition and managed within their broader ecosystem and cultural context.
- Ib** The National Park Service contributes to knowledge about natural and cultural resources and associated values; management decisions about resources and visitors are based on adequate scholarly and scientific information.
- Ila** Visitors safely enjoy and are satisfied with the availability, accessibility, diversity, and quality of park facilities, services, and appropriate recreational opportunities.
- Ilb** Park visitors and the general public understand and appreciate the preservation of parks and their resources for this and future generations.

**Activity Description****General Management and Strategic Planning: \$7.900 million**

The National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 directs the NPS to prepare and revise in a timely manner "General Management Plans for the preservation and use of each unit of the National Park System." General Management Plans (GMPs) establish specific goals and objectives, a basic philosophy for management, and strategies for resolving major issues related to park purposes as defined by Congress. GMPs are required by law to include:

1. measures for preservation of the area's resources,
2. indications of the type and general intensity of development including visitor circulation and transportation patterns along with locations, timing, and anticipated costs,
3. identification of visitor carrying capacities, and
4. indications of potential modifications to the external boundaries of the unit.

General management plans provide the basic guidance for how the park will carry out responsibilities for protection of park resources unimpaired for future generations while providing for appropriate visitor use and

enjoyment. The GMP also provides a framework for coordinating interpretive programs, maintenance, facility development, and resource management to promote efficient operations. Priorities for funding general management planning projects are determined by an evaluation of issues confronting the parks and statutory requirements for recently authorized additions to the National Park System. In FY 2003, a system based on the choosing by advantages methodology will continue to be used to determine priorities for GMP starts and maintain accountability for completion of projects within estimated budgets. The Servicewide priority list for GMP's was completely revised in 2001, and updated in 2002.

Plans are prepared by interdisciplinary teams including the park superintendent and staff, landscape architects, community planners, and specialists in natural and cultural resources, environmental design, concessions management, interpretation, public involvement and other fields as needed. Consistent with recommendations by the National Academy of Public Administration, approximately 60 percent of the Service's general management planning work is accomplished by the Denver Service Center, with the balance accomplished by staff in support offices and by contractors. The planning process includes extensive consultation with the public and State, local, and tribal officials, to clearly define park purpose and significance, goals and objectives, identify desired future conditions, and evaluate alternatives.

A final, approved planning document is only one obvious result of the planning process. Some other important results of general management planning include community understanding of park mission and goals, guidance on appropriate treatments for natural and cultural resources, coordination with State and local officials and other agencies, and cooperation with adjacent land managers and property owners. Plans also evaluate environmental consequences and socioeconomic impacts, estimate differences in costs, and identify phasing for implementation. Cooperation with park neighbors and mitigation of potential impacts on park resources are especially important results of management planning. In FY 2003, increased emphasis will be placed assuring that NPS produces realistic plans that consider fiscal constraints on the Federal Government, promote partnerships to help accomplish results, and support creative solutions to management challenges that do not necessarily depend on development of new facilities.

NPS guidelines indicate that general management plans should be designed for a ten to fifteen year timeframe. While plans for some units are viable for more than fifteen years, many others become obsolete in less than five years. Changes in resource conditions, public use patterns, external influences, and legislated boundaries often come more frequently than expected. Many plans approved in past years envision a level of new development and staffing that is not likely to be realized in the foreseeable future, so these plans need to be revised. As of December 31, 2001, more than 200 parks lack a GMP or have one that is more than fifteen years old and overdue to be replaced or substantially amended. The GMP program also supports management planning for units of the National Trails System, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Affiliated Areas and other special projects where Congress has directed the NPS to prepare a management plan in cooperation with others.

The National Park Service is continuing efforts to streamline its planning function and improve services to parks and the public. In FY 2003, a small portion of the program will continue to provide a variety of planning services to meet needs defined by parks and their partners without necessarily completing all of the steps in a traditional general management plan. General Management Plans are not intended to provide specifications for facility design. However, in FY 2003 a small portion of the GMP program will be used to support site development assessments or concept plans for critical areas where environmental or other compliance and planning needs to be conducted in advance of facility design. Linkages between general management planning and other strategic and operational planning in the National Park Service also will continue to be improved. Planning at various levels of detail will help support the performance management system developed to meet requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act.

In FY 2001, general management plans for ten units were completed. The rate of plan completion in FY 2001 was below target primarily because of staff reductions in the Denver Service Center, and competing commitments in support offices and new steps required to complete environmental or other compliance documents. Many projects also were delayed by requests for additional opportunities for public comment. The rate of completion is expected to improve as more contractors develop experience in completing GMP projects. Plans for 31 units are tentatively scheduled for completion in FY 2002 anticipating that some delays will still allow meeting a target of 25 completions. The time and cost to complete many general management plans reflects factors be-

yond the immediate control of the NPS such as the increased demands for extended consultation with a wide variety of interested individuals and organizations, coordination with State and local governments, tribal governments, and other Federal agencies. The requested level of funding for FY 2003 would provide for a sustainable level of planning to meet legislative requirements. The small decrease in this program for FY 2003 represents a net result of payroll increases and economies to be achieved in Servicewide travel.

Following is a list of general management planning projects where FY 2002 is the last year that funds will be required. If records of decision are not final in FY 2002 they are expected to follow early in FY 2003. A list of projects that are expected to be in progress during 2003 and a list of new starts also is included. These lists are subject to change in response to requests to accelerate or delay schedules to better coordinate with partners, available staff or contractors, and other agencies.

#### General Management Plans Scheduled for Completion of Funding in FY 2002

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acadia National Park, Maine</li> <li>• Arkansas Post National Memorial, Arkansas</li> <li>• Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area, Tennessee</li> <li>• Boston African American National Historic Site, Massachusetts</li> <li>• Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area, Massachusetts</li> <li>• Cane River Heritage Area, Louisiana</li> <li>• Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area, Georgia</li> <li>• Colonial National Historical Park, Green Spring Unit, Virginia</li> <li>• Coronado National Monument, Arizona</li> <li>• Denali National Park, Alaska</li> <li>• Devils Tower National Monument, Wyoming</li> <li>• Fort Circle Parks, District of Columbia</li> <li>• Fort Stanwix National Monument, New York</li> <li>• Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota</li> <li>• Hampton National Historic Site, Maryland</li> <li>• Kenai Fjords National Park, Alaska</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lassen Volcanic National Park, California</li> <li>• Lincoln Boyhood Home National Memorial, Indiana</li> <li>• Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site, Arkansas</li> <li>• Lower East Side Tenement NHS, New York</li> <li>• Mary McLeod Bethune Council House National Historic Site, District of Columbia</li> <li>• Mojave National Preserve, California</li> <li>• Morristown National Historical Park, New Jersey</li> <li>• Nicodemus National Historic Site, Kansas</li> <li>• Niobrara National Scenic Riverway, Nebraska</li> <li>• Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, Michigan</li> <li>• Rock Creek Park, District of Columbia</li> <li>• Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway, Wisconsin</li> <li>• Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, California</li> <li>• Saratoga National Historical Park, New York</li> <li>• Selma to Montgomery National Historic Trail, Alabama</li> <li>• Shiloh National Military Park, Tennessee</li> <li>• Wilson's Creek National Battlefield, Missouri</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

#### Anticipated FY 2003 General Management Planning Work

##### Ongoing Projects

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amistad National Recreational Area, Texas</li> <li>• Anacostia Park, District of Columbia</li> <li>• Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Park, Virginia</li> <li>• Badlands National Park, South Dakota</li> <li>• Bering Land Bridge National Preserve, Alaska</li> <li>• Big Bend National Park, Texas</li> <li>• Big Cypress National Preserve, Florida</li> <li>• Big Thicket National Preserve, Texas</li> <li>• Biscayne National Park, Florida</li> <li>• Blue Ridge Parkway, North Carolina</li> <li>• Canyon de Chelly National Monument, Arizona</li> <li>• Cape Krusenstern National Monument, Alaska</li> <li>• Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, Florida</li> <li>• Channel Islands National Park, California</li> <li>• Chickasaw National Recreation Area, Oklahoma</li> <li>• Crater Lake National Park, Oregon</li> <li>• Craters of the Moon National Monument, Idaho</li> <li>• Curecanti National Recreation Area, Colorado</li> <li>• Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve, Washington</li> <li>• El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro, Texas, New Mexico</li> <li>• Everglades National Park, Florida</li> <li>• Fallen Timbers Battlefield, Ohio</li> <li>• First Ladies Library National Historic Site, Ohio</li> <li>• Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Washington</li> <li>• Gates of the Arctic National Preserve, Alaska</li> <li>• Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve, Alaska</li> <li>• Golden Gate National Recreation Area, California</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument, Arizona</li> <li>• Great Sand Dunes National Park, Colorado</li> <li>• Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Texas</li> <li>• Hopewell Furnace National Historic Site, Pennsylvania</li> <li>• Kobuk Valley National Park, Alaska</li> <li>• Lake Meredith National Recreation Area, Texas</li> <li>• Minuteman Missile National Historic Site, South Dakota</li> <li>• Monocacy National Battlefield, Maryland</li> <li>• New River Gorge National River, West Virginia</li> <li>• Noatak National Preserve, Alaska</li> <li>• Olympic National Park, Washington</li> <li>• Pea Ridge National Military Park, Arkansas</li> <li>• Pinnacles National Monument, California</li> <li>• Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota</li> <li>• Point Reyes National Seashore, California</li> <li>• Rosie the Riveter WWII Homefront National Historic Park, California</li> <li>• Saguaro National Park, Arizona</li> <li>• San Juan Island National Historical Park, Washington</li> <li>• Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Park, California</li> <li>• Shenandoah National Park, Virginia</li> <li>• Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Michigan</li> <li>• Thomas Cole National Historic Site, New York</li> <li>• Valley Forge National Historical Park, Pennsylvania</li> <li>• Virgin Islands National Park, Virgin Islands</li> <li>• Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve, Alaska</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

**Recently Authorized Units, Unit Expansions, and Potential New Starts in FY 2003**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ala Kahakai National Historic Trail, Hawaii</li> <li>• Aztec Ruins National Monument, New Mexico</li> <li>• Buck Island Reef National Monument, Virgin Islands</li> <li>• Buffalo National River, Arkansas</li> <li>• Canaveral National Seashore, Florida</li> <li>• Cape Hatteras National Seashore, North Carolina</li> <li>• Cape Lookout National Seashore, North Carolina</li> <li>• Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument, New Mexico</li> <li>• Governors Island National Monument, New York</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grand Teton National Park, Wyoming</li> <li>• Great Smoky Mountains National Park, North Carolina</li> <li>• Gulf Islands National Seashore, Florida</li> <li>• Hovenweep National Monument, Colorado</li> <li>• Minidoka Internment National Monument, Idaho</li> <li>• Tuskegee Airmen National Historic Site, Alabama</li> <li>• Virgin Islands Coral Reef National Monument, Virgin Islands</li> <li>• Wekiva Wild and Scenic River, Florida</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

Another major component of the Service's multi-year planning function is the strategic planning program which ensures the NPS and its leadership has a focused systematic approach to developing long-term strategies and the continuous organizational development needed to address changing social, political, economic, and demographic realities. This program participates in the development and implementation of major Servicewide initiatives that involve long-range planning in support of the mission and goals of the NPS. Another major responsibility for this program is ongoing coordination of Servicewide implementation of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA). In FY 2002, the third *National Park Service Strategic Plan (2004-2008)* will be completed in coordination with the Departmental Strategic Plan. Servicewide information and guidance providing organizational support for a field-oriented process of GPRA implementation is provided through a National Park Service Field Guide to Performance Management and other support documents. Annual performance plans are produced in conjunction with each fiscal year budget request cycle. Work will continue in FY2003 for Servicewide GPRA and performance management implementation through:

1. ongoing coordination of the *National Park Service Strategic Plan* implementation,
2. preparation and/or revision of Servicewide Fiscal Year 2003 and 2004 Annual Performance Plans that parallel the budget formulation process,
3. preparation of Servicewide Annual Performance Report for FY 2002,
4. ongoing participation in preparation and revision of departmental strategic plan, and NPS Annual Performance Plans and Reports,
5. extensive coordination with five Servicewide goal groups (natural, cultural, visitors, external partnerships, and organizational effectiveness) on refinement of Servicewide goals, development of strategies to achieve goals, identification of external factors affecting goal achievement, data refinement, verification and validation, and program evaluations,
6. ongoing Servicewide training for performance management and GPRA implementation,
7. extensive coordination with Regional GPRA coordinators and Regional Goal Contacts and support to park and programs in their implementation of performance management and extensive training of park staffs,
8. refinement and expansion of Servicewide electronic performance management reporting system,
9. extensive performance data analysis and evaluation, and performance data verification and validation, and
10. the ongoing refinement of linkages with operations, information systems, budget formulation and financial reporting systems, planning, and personnel.

**Special Resource Studies: \$1.0 million**

As directed by Congress (16 U.S.C. 1a-5), the National Park Service monitors resources that exhibit qualities of national significance and conducts studies where specifically authorized to determine if areas have potential for inclusion in the National Park System. Special Resource Studies collect information about candidate areas to determine if they meet established criteria for significance, suitability, and feasibility as potential additions to the National Park System. These studies also evaluate alternative concepts for protection by others outside of the National Park System. The primary purposes of the study program are to provide information for Congress in evaluating the quality of potential new park units, and to encourage the protection of important resources in ways that will not impose undue pressure on the limited fiscal resources available for existing NPS units.

In 2002, the NPS has 24 studies in progress supported by this program and 5 additional studies that are completed but in the transmittal process to Congress. Fourteen of these studies were authorized in FY 2000, and four were authorized in FY 2001. Over the past 20 years only about one in every four or five studies finds

that an area is eligible for inclusion in the National Park System. The study program has included many projects directed by Congress where the NPS and the community have agreed that existing programs of technical or financial assistance are preferable to the establishment of a new park with long-term management responsibilities and major funding commitments for the NPS. Experience to date has indicated that adequately prepared studies help defend the integrity of the park system against expansions into areas that fail to meet established standards, while allowing for a few carefully selected new units that are of outstanding importance to the national heritage.

Public Law 105-391, enacted on November 13, 1998, updated the process for considering new additions to the National Park System. Each new study proposal is required to be forwarded to Congress and specifically authorized. The study program in 2002 and in 2003 will focus on completing projects previously directed by Congress to evaluate important resources and find ways to protect them that do not necessarily involve Federal land acquisition or long-term commitments for management and operations by the NPS. These studies will place an increased emphasis on examining the full life-cycle operation and maintenance costs that would result from a newly created or expanded park unit or some other NPS funding responsibility.

- In FY 2002, 14 projects authorized in previous years are scheduled for completion with respect to funding needs. Most of those studies are expected to recommend alternatives to the creation of new NPS units. Following is a list of Special Resource Study projects expected to be ongoing in FY 2003. The Department does not intend to recommend any additional areas for study in FY 2003 so that progress can be made in completing the projects currently underway. The National Park Service expects that additional analysis of life cycle costs and environmental consequences will identify the potential costs of adding new units to the NPS.
- The Department intends to focus its attention and resources on taking care of existing responsibilities, such as addressing facility maintenance needs, rather than continuing the rapid expansion of new NPS responsibilities. The Department does not expect to submit a list of proposed authorizations for any new studies or new park units along with the budget submission as envisioned by Public Law 105-391.

#### **Special Resource Studies Scheduled for Completion of Funding in FY 2002**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| • Anderson Cottage, District of Columbia               | • Loess Hills, Iowa  |
| • Battle of Homestead and Carrie Furnace, Pennsylvania | • Low Country Gullah Culture, South Carolina, Florida, Georgia |
| • Bioluminescent Bays, Puerto Rico                     | • Northern Frontier, New York                                  |
| • Carter G. Woodson Home, District of Columbia         | • Robert R. Moton High School, Virginia                        |
| • Crossroads of the American Revolution, New Jersey    | • Walden Pond and Woods, Massachusetts                         |
| • Ferry Farm, Virginia                                 | • World War II Sites in Peleiu                                 |
| • Fort King, Florida                                   |  |
| • Lincoln Highway, Multi State                         |  |

#### **Previously Authorized and Ongoing Studies in FY 2003**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| • Chesapeake Bay Sites, Maryland and Virginia | • Kate Mullaney House, New York  |
| • Civil Rights Sites, Multi-state             | • Upper Housatonic River Valley, Connecticut                             |
| • Fort Hunter Liggett, California             | • Vicksburg Campaign Trail, Multi State                                  |
| • Gaviota Coast, California                   | • Washington & Rochambeau in the American Revolutionary War, Multi-state |
| • Harriet Tubman Sites, New York and Maryland |  |

#### **Environmental Impact Statement Planning and Compliance: \$4.996 million**

The National Park Omnibus Management Act of 1998 and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) require park management decisions to be based on a full examination of alternatives and impacts and opportunities for public involvement. This program enhances the National Park Service's ability to prepare environmental impact statements and fulfill other environmental planning and evaluations required by law. This program provides for preparation of environmental analysis for decisions on actions and projects that do not fit within the normal scope of the construction program or the general management-planning program. Management decisions on trail planning, wildlife population and control measures in eastern parks, planning for land exchanges with local governments, providing for cooperative land use planning and management with local governments, and initial funding for authorization of personal watercraft use are among the issues evaluated during FY 2002. This funding allows the requisite planning and environmental evaluation to take

place so that decisions can be reached and implemented without use of park base funds. Park base funding normally does not anticipate preparation of complex environmental documents, as a result decisions on important resource management or other issues are delayed or deferred, resulting in a decision backlog which may compound resource damage or result in inadequate public participation.

The FY 2003 level requested for this program would be used to respond to an increasing number of court or legislatively mandated environmental documents to support sound resource based decisions. Funding would also be utilized to support technically proficient project leaders to work with park based specialists in preparing complex documents, facilitate public and agency reviews, and help ensure that decisions are legally and environmentally sustainable. Anticipated results would include better conditions for park resources, improved quality of visitor experiences, decisions that are upheld in court, and reduced costs for projects conducted under court mandated schedules.